

AstraZeneca Docket No. 100507-1 US
Application No. 10/051,776
Page 2

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner has objected to Claim 1 in part for containing distinct and independent inventions and has requested a restriction to one of six inventions in accord with 35 U.S.C. 121 stating that the compounds of Groups I-III are drawn to structurally diverse compounds, requiring separate classification and literature searches.

Applicants elect Group VI, with traverse. Applicants respectfully point out that the disclosed compounds, as exemplified by the specification, share a common structural relationship. The compounds of Claim 1 are all structurally similar; for example they all have a chromene core structure. The compounds of Claim 1 are also functionally similar as illuminated by the specification. Hence, the structural and functional commonality shared by the compounds of Claim 1 makes separate classification and separate literature searches unnecessary.

The examiner will further appreciate that, due to the structural and functional similarity between the compounds of Claim 1, the instant application does not lack unity of invention.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that this application be examined on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 5, 2003

By: 

George A. Gilbert
Reg. No. 35,881
Telephone: 1-302-886-3887